

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

ARTHUR W. CARSON,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
VS.	)	
	)	3:06-CV-2123-G
NATHANIEL QUARTERMAN, Director,	)	
Texas Department of Criminal Justice,	)	ECF
Correctional Institutions Division,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**ORDER OF THE COURT ON THE FOREGOING RECOMMENDATION**

Considering the record in this case and the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2253 (c), the court hereby finds and orders:

**IFP STATUS:**

- ☐ the party appealing is **GRANTED** *in forma pauperis* status on appeal.
- ☒ the party appealing is proceeding *in forma pauperis*.
- ☐ the party appealing is **DENIED** *in forma pauperis* status on appeal for the following reasons:
  - ☐ the court certifies, pursuant to FED. R. APP. P. 24(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (a)(3), that the appeal is not taken in good faith. In support of this finding, the court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendation entered in this case on November 2, 2006. Based upon the

Magistrate Judge's findings, this court finds that the appeal presents no legal points of arguable merit and is therefore frivolous. See *Harkins v. Roberts*, 935 F. Supp. 871, 873 (S.D. Miss. 1996) (citing *Howard v. King*, 707 F. 2d 215, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1983)).

- ( ) the person appealing is not a pauper;
- ( ) the person appealing has not complied with the requirements of Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) as ordered by the court. (See Notice of Deficiency and Order entered on \_\_\_\_\_).

**COA:**

- ( ) a Certificate of Appealability is **GRANTED** on the following issues: \_\_\_\_\_.
- (X) a Certificate of Appealability is **DENIED**. The court hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendation filed in this case on April 18, 2007, in support of its finding that petitioner has failed to demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000).

**SO ORDERED.**

May 23, 2007.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
A. JOE FISH  
CHIEF JUDGE